Supplementary Information for:

Shackleford, C., Rabinowitz, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2026). Stigma-based solidarity betrayal: Implications for resistance to the rise of ethno-nationalism in the U.S. *advances.in/psychology, 1*, e349228. https://doi.org/10.56296/aip00044

Study 1: Additional Measures and Analyses

Emotions

In addition to betrayal and surprise, participants also rated the extent to which they felt *disappointed, sad*, *happy*, and *hopeful* when considering the hypothetical voting behavior of the focal outgroup for their condition (White men or Arab Americans) on 5-point response scales (1 = *not at all to* 5 = *very much so*). Each emotion was submitted to a 2 (election outcome) x 2 (focal outgroup) ANOVA. Analyses revealed significant effects of both target group and election outcome on most emotions. Specifically, participants in the Trump wins condition reported greater disappointment, $F(1, 940) = 325.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .26$, and sadness, $F(1, 939) = 508.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .35$, and lower happiness, $F(1, 938) = 110.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = 0.11$, and hope, $F(1, 941) = 162.32$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .15$, compared with participants in the Harris wins condition. Additionally, participants in the White men condition reported greater disappointment, $F(1, 940) = 74.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .07$, and sadness, $F(1, 939) = 73.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .07$, but lower happiness, $F(1, 938) = 8.82$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .009$, compared with those in the Arab Americans condition. The effect of focal outgroup on hope was non-significant, $F(1, 941) = 0.68$, $p = .409$, $\eta^2_p < .001$. A significant interaction between conditions emerged for disappointment, $F(1, 940) = 11.28$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, sadness, $F(1, 939) = 9.22$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .009$, and happiness, $F(1, 938) = 12.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, such that the effect of the focal outgroup was greater in the Harris wins condition compared to the Trump wins condition. The interaction between conditions did not emerge for hope, $F(1, 940) = 1.55$, $p = .214$, $\eta^2_p = .001$.

Collective Solidarity

In addition to reporting their intentions to work together with White men and Arab Americans in the future, participants also completed this item regarding Black men– a minoritized comparison outgroup not implicated in our manipulation. The results of analyses of the full model: 2 (election outcome) x 2 (focal outgroup) x 3 (target) are presented below:

There was a significant main effect of target, $F(2, 1870) = 257.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .22$; participants reported greater willingness to work with Black men– the only non-focal outgroup– compared with Arab Americans, $t(939) = 15.27$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.50$, and even lower willingness to work with White men in the future, $t(938) = 9.44$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.31$. This effect was qualified by a significant interaction between focal outgroup condition and target, $F(2, 1870) = 18.93$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, such that participants who considered the voting behavior of White men subsequently believed that women should work together with White men even less than did participants in the Arab American condition, $t(937) = 3.96$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.26$. By contrast, solidarity intentions toward Arab Americans, $t(938) = -0.47$, $p = .638$, $d = -0.03$, and Black men, $t(938) = -1.13$, $p = .257$, $d = -.07$, did not differ as a function of focal outgroup condition. The main effects of focal outgroup condition and election outcome, as well as the three-way interaction between outgroup condition, election outcome, and target, were not significant (*ps* > .224).

Policy Support

In addition to reporting their support for policies related to Arab Americans, participants were also asked to indicate their support for two policies primarily affecting women (i.e., expanding and protecting reproductive health care, gender pay gap) and one relevant to working-class Americans (i.e., raising the federal minimum wage). Support was indicated on 7-point scales (1 = *strongly oppose,* 7 = *strongly support*). Analyses revealed no

effects of election outcome, focal outgroup, or their interaction on support for any of these policies, Fs < 2.99, ps >.084, η^2_p < .003.

Responsibility for the Outcome of the Election

As an exploratory measure, we asked participants to report how much they thought that White men, Arab Americans, White women and Black men would be responsible for the outcome of the election (rated from 1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much so*). Across conditions, participants believed that White men would be more responsible for the election outcome than Arab Americans, $t(941) = -35.04$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.14$ and Black men, $t(940) = 16.51$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.54$, and marginally more than White women (the ingroup), $t(942) = 1.89$, $p = .060$, $d = 0.06$.

Betrayal as a Mediator of Future Solidarity Intentions.

We examined whether participants' feelings of betrayal mediated the relationship between focal outgroup and solidarity intentions. To do so, we conducted a between-subject simple mediation model. Analyses revealed that the relationship between target group and solidarity intentions was significantly mediated by betrayal ($\beta = -0.15$, $p < .001$). Exposure to white men as the focal outgroup contributed to increased betrayal, which contributed to decreased solidarity intentions.

Study 2: Additional Relevant Measures and Analyses

Country-level Betrayal

White women agreed with the item, "I feel betrayed by my country," significantly more than Black women did, $t(1037.3) = -7.40$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.45$.

Emotions

In addition to surprise, participants also rated the extent to which they felt *hurt*, *angry, disappointed*, and *afraid* as a result of the voting behavior of each target group. Items were rated on 5-point scales (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much so*).

Hurt. White women reported greater hurt than Black women, $F(1, 1109) = 201.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .15$. Participants reported greater hurt at the behavior of Latino men, $F(1, 1104) = 103.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .09$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 1104) = 223.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .17$. Black women were more hurt by Latino men than White men, $t(535) = 17.14$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.78$, while White women were more hurt by White men than Latino men, $t(569) = -3.23$, $p = .001$, $d = -0.12$.

Anger. White women reported greater anger than Black women, $F(1, 1110) = 219.60$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .17$. The main effect of focal outgroup was non-significant, $F(1, 1103) = 0.46$, $p = .498$, $\eta^2_p = < .001$, but the interaction was significant, $F(1, 1103) = 246.77$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .18$. Black women reported more anger toward Latino men than White men, $t (535) = 10.59$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.40$, while White women reported more anger toward White men than Latino men, $t (568) = -11.81$, $p < .001$, $d = -0.40$.

Disappointment. White women reported greater disappointment than Black women, $F(1, 1111) = 235.07$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .17$. Participants reported greater disappointment at Latino men than White men, $F(1, 1106) = 350.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .24$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 1106) = 264.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .19$. Black women reported greater relative disappointment in Latino men compared to White men, $t (537) = 20.33$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.93$, than did White women, $t (569) = 2.81$, $p = .005$, $d = 0.10$.

Fear. White women reported greater fear than Black women, $F(1, 1108) = 175.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .14$. Additionally, participants reported greater fear at the behavior of White men

than the behavior of Latino men, $F(1, 1105) = 167.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .13$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 1105) = 43.39$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .04$. White women reported greater relative fear of White men's behavior than of Latino men's behavior, t (570) = -14.65, $p < .001$, d = -0.48, compared to Black women, t (535) = -4.05, $p < .001$, d = -0.15.

Solidarity

In addition to the collective solidarity items reported in the main text, participants completed two other measures.

General intergroup solidarity orientation. Three items assessed participants' general intergroup solidarity orientation (e.g., "[Black/White] women should treat other oppressed groups as allies;" (α = .79). Black women (M = 4.04, CI [3.94, 4.14]) expressed lower belief that they should be allied with other stigmatized groups compared with White women (M = 5.19, CI [5.13, 5.26], t(921.59) = -19.00, $p < .001$, d = -1.15.

Ingroup focus. One item assessed participants' inclination to prioritize their own ingroup in the future (i.e., "It is time for [Black] women to prioritize issues that affect [Black] women and let other oppressed groups fight their own battles"). Black women (M = 4.48, CI [4.35, 4.61]) reported a greater desire to prioritize their own group's needs compared with White women (M = 2.90, CI [2.77, 3.02]), t(1107.9) = 16.78, $p < .001$, d = 1.01. Degrees of freedom differ between the general intergroup solidarity test (which uses a composite score) and the ingroup focus test (which uses a single item) due to Welch's correction, which adjusts for unequal variances and group sizes.

Voting Expectations, Closeness, Responsibility, and Status

We assessed a number of exploratory items that could relate to perceived betrayal: Harris voting expectations, perceived closeness, responsibility for the election outcome, and power/status for each focal outgroup.

Voting expectations. Participants indicated how they had expected each focal outgroup to vote before the election (1 = *definitely Trump* to 4 = *definitely Harris*). Analyses revealed participants expected Latino men to vote for Harris more than White men, $F(1, 1111) = 2848.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .72$. White women overall had higher Harris vote expectations for both groups than Black women, $F(1, 1112) = 21.22$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .02$. The interaction was significant, $F(1, 1111) = 5.66$, $p = .018$, $\eta^2_p = .001$. Black women showed a greater Harris vote expectation gap between Latino and White men than White women.

Closeness. Participants reported how close they felt to each focal outgroup (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much so*). Analyses revealed participants felt closer to White men than Latino men, $F(1, 1113) = 42.61$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .04$. White women reported greater overall closeness than did Black women, $F(1, 1113) = 105.38$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .09$. Again, the interaction was significant, $F(1, 1113) = 123.77$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .10$. White women felt closer to White men ($p < .001$), while Black women felt closer to Latino men ($p = .001$).

Responsibility. Participants rated how responsible each focal outgroup was for the election outcome (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much so)*. Analyses revealed that participants saw White men as more responsible for the election outcome than Latino men, $F(1, 1114) = 238.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .18$. Black women's overall ratings of responsibility were somewhat higher than White women's, $F(1, 1114) = 2.83$, $p = .093$, $\eta^2_p = .002$. These effects were qualified by a significant interaction, $F(1, 1114) = 33.83$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .03$. White women held White men more responsible than Latino men ($p < .001$), compared with Black women ($p < .001$), who perceived the responsibility of the two groups as more comparable.

Power/status. Participants rated the power/status of each focal outgroup (1 = l*east power/status* to 5 = *most power/status*). Analyses revealed that participants thought White men have more societal power than Latino men, $F(1, 1105) = 5476.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .83$.

White women reported higher ratings of power/status than Black women, $F(1, 1110) = 48.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .04$. The interaction was significant but small, $F(1, 1105) = 4.14$, $p = .042$, $\eta^2_p = .003$; compared to Black women, White women perceived a slightly greater power/status differential between Latino and White men.

Betrayal as a Mediator of Future Solidarity Intentions

As in Study 1, we examined whether participants' feelings of betrayal mediate the relationship between the focal outgroup and solidarity intentions. Because our design included a within-subject comparison with participants belonging to two different racial groups, we first conducted two separate multilevel mediation analyses for Black and White participants, and then we conducted a multilevel moderated mediation analysis, including all participants with participant race as the moderator. This approach allowed us to account for the non-independence of observations nested within each participant while testing whether the mediation pathway was different for Black versus White participants. The indirect effects for both Black and White participants were estimated to assess whether the mediation was present and significant for each group.

Among White women, neither individual nor collective betrayal significantly mediates the relationship between target group and solidarity intentions ($\beta \geq -0.009$, $p \geq .540$).

Among Black women, conversely, both individual and collective betrayal mediate the relationship between target group and solidarity intentions ($\beta \geq 0.07$, $p \leq .019$). In both cases, exposure to the Latino target group was associated with increased reported betrayal relative to the White target group. This increase in betrayal, in turn, was linked to an increase in solidarity intentions.

Mirroring these separate mediation analyses, results from our moderated mediation analysis revealed a significant interaction by participant race, for both individual (β = -1.672, p <.001) and collective (β = 0.78, p < .001) betrayal, such that the effect of the target group on reported betrayal is significantly different for White participants compared to Black participants.

For White participants, exposure to the Latino target group was marginally associated with decreased collective and individual betrayal relative to the White target group, which in turn was linked to an increase in solidarity intentions (β ≤ -0.008, p ≤ .073).

For Black participants, exposure to the Latino target group was marginally associated with increased collective and individual betrayal relative to the White target group, which again was linked to an *increase* in solidarity intentions (β ≥ 0.042, p ≤ .067).

Threat Manipulation

Study 2 included a manipulation expected to increase the salience of threat and the stakes of the election; specifically, at the start of the experiment, after reflecting on the outcome of the election, participants were randomly assigned to consider threats of a Trump presidency, the (lost) promise of a Harris presidency, or to do neither of these tasks. We analyzed the effect of this condition through 2 (participant race) x 2 (target outgroup) x 3 (threat salience condition) ANOVAs for variables relevant to the target outgroups. For variables that did not concern the target outgroups specifically (e.g., country-level betrayal), we analyzed the effect of this condition through 2 (participant race) x 3 (threat salience condition) ANOVAs. Policy opposition was submitted to a 2 (participant race) x 4 (policy target: low-income people, Latine people, Black people, women) x 3 (threat salience condition) mixed model ANOVA.

We found no main effects of the threat salience manipulation on participants' individual betrayal, $F(2, 1107) = 0.24$, $p = .785$, $\eta^2_p < .001$, collective betrayal, $F(2, 1106) = 0.58$, $p = .563$, $\eta^2_p = .001$, country-level betrayal, $F(2, 1108) = 1.73$, $p = .178$, $\eta^2_p = .003$, surprise, $F(2, 1106) = 0.73$, $p = .481$, $\eta^2_p = .001$, or any other emotion ($ps \geq .157$). Additionally, no significant interactive effects were observed on these variables ($ps \geq .054$).

Similarly, we found no main effects of the threat salience manipulation on participants' solidarity intentions toward the target outgroups, $F(2, 1109) = 1.37$, $p = .256$, $\eta^2_p = .002$, nor on participants' general intergroup solidarity intentions, $F(2, 1108) = 0.77$, $p = .462$, $\eta^2_p = .001$, or ingroup prioritization, $F(2, 1110) = 1.38$, $p = .253$, $\eta^2_p = .002$. We also found no main effect of the threat salience manipulation on participants' policy opposition, $F(2, 1107) = 1.05$, $p = .350$, $\eta^2_p = .002$. Additionally, no significant interactive effects were observed on these variables ($ps \geq .158$).

Finally, we found no significant main or interactive effects of the threat salience manipulation on participants' perceived closeness, responsibility, status, or expected voting behavior of the target groups ($ps \geq .178$), nor on their reported reasons for feeling betrayed ($ps \geq .091$)